

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Valerie Wilkins,

Plaintiff,

v.

Jeff Sessions,

Defendant.

---

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

C/A No. 8:17-cv-803-TMC

**ORDER**

In her amended complaint, Plaintiff Valerie Wilkins, proceeding pro se, alleges claims of discrimination, retaliation, and retaliatory hostile work environment pursuant to Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e. (ECF No. 16). This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of the United States Magistrate Judge, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). (ECF No. 64). In her Report, the magistrate judge recommends that the court grant in part and deny in part Defendant Jeff Sessions’ summary judgment motion (ECF No. 52). (ECF No. 64 at 34). Specifically, the magistrate judge recommends that summary judgment be granted as to Plaintiff’s claims for discrimination and retaliation but denied as to her claim for retaliatory hostile work environment. *Id.* The parties were informed of their right to file objections. (ECF No. 64-1). However, neither party has filed objections, and the time to file objections has run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but

instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a thorough and careful review of the record, the court adopts the Report of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 64), which is incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, Defendant’ Summary Judgment Motion (ECF No. 52) is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part**. Accordingly, only Plaintiff’s claim for retaliatory hostile work environment remains pending.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina  
June 26, 2018

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

